Agenda
East Campus Residence Hall User Group
Meeting #12
12:30pm-2:45 pm, Aug 20, 2009

1. Project update. 10 min.

2. U of O Architectural Style Presentation 60 min

3. Review updated program 15 min
   a. Confirm number and size of classrooms

4. Review of updated first floor plan layouts. 40 min.
   a. Confirm learning center location and size
   b. Discuss first floor Residence rooms entrances

5. Next user group meeting – September 10th

6. Next open space meeting – September 10th
Meeting Time & Location
University of Oregon, Walton Hall – McAlister Room
August 20, 2009, 12:30 – 2:50 PM
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Gregg Lobisser, Sandy Schoonover, Martina Bill
Tom Driscoll, Allen Gidley, George Bleekman
Emily Eng

ZIMMER GUNSUL FRASCA ARCHITECTS LLP
Mark Foster, Josh Peacock, Milena DiTomaso
Franco Rosete, Lee Kerns

HOFFMAN CONSTRUCTION
Stephanie Coyle

CITY OF EUGENE
Bill Lemons, Steve McGuire

Distribution
Those present, Fred Tepfer, Virginia Cartwright, Sean Landry, Jon Erlandson, Aly Stanton, Ryan Wagner, Adrian Ho, Lisa Cline, Jacob McKay, Sue Kerns, Joanna Brickman, and Master File

1. Purpose of the Meeting

This was the 11th meeting of the East Campus Residence Hall (ECRH) User Group. Copies of the graphic information and agenda presented at the meeting are attached.

The purpose of the meeting was for UO to present the UO campus character review. Martina presented a Power Point of existing UO buildings. The presentation was broken down by the design categories listed below for discussion.

ZGF followed this presentation with further updates on the schematic design plans and the initial massing images of the building.

A meeting with the building cost estimators followed this meeting.
2. Project Update from Gregg Lobisser
   2.1 No new items.

3. Campus Character Review
   3.1 Campus Character
      3.1.1 Create a sense of place.
      3.1.2 Identity
      3.1.3 New buildings do not need to mimic original buildings.
      3.1.4 Preserve campus character.

3.2 Characteristics of Materials
   3.2.1 Brick is the dominant exterior material on campus.
   3.2.2 Stucco has been used with brick as an accent material.
   3.2.3 Wood, metal panels and concrete have also been used on campus.
   3.2.4 Materials should be high quality.
   3.2.5 Human scale
   3.2.6 Carefully detailed

3.3 How the Building Meets the Sky
   3.3.1 New buildings do not have to have a flat roof. There are examples of flat roof buildings on campus with edge articulation and height variety, as well as sloped roofs.
   3.3.2 Flat roofs can be a maintenance concern due to low slope for water drainage.
   3.3.3 Roof to wall edge should be articulated.

3.4 Rhythm of Windows
   3.4.1 Punch openings preferred vs. long strip windows.
   3.4.2 Window articulation adds to character of elevation.
   3.4.3 Windows should reflect use of building and scale of spaces behind.
   3.4.4 Detailing and material choice should be appropriate to building use.
   3.4.5 Maintenance of windows is a significant concern for housing.
      3.4.5.1 Window washing.
      3.4.5.2 Glass replacement from inside.
      3.4.5.3 Maintenance or refinishing of exterior should be minimal.

3.5 Main Building Entrance
   3.5.1 Should be easily identified as the front door.
      3.5.1.1 LLC has multiple entrances due to location and site circulation patterns but not a clear identifiable front door.
      3.5.1.2 Scale of entry form can reinforce use.
   3.5.2 Articulation of the entry surround and door design/scale can also reinforce the front door location.
   3.5.3 Entries need to be protected from the weather by recessing or providing a canopy or portico.

3.6 Secondary Entrances
   3.6.1 Should have some visual interest, not plain, but should not compete with main entry.
   3.6.2 Weather protected.
   3.6.3 Identifiable by change of material or articulation.

3.7 Operable Windows and Window Details
   3.7.1 Operable windows are preferred for user comfort.
   3.7.2 Scale of window and patterns of mullions important to reflect use and provide visual interest.
3.7.3 Housing indicated that they generally do not need screens on residence room windows due to maintenance concerns. Screens should be provided on windows in food preparation areas.

3.7.4 Window sills below guardrail height should not open more than 4 inches to meet building code requirements.

3.7.5 Interior glazed.

3.7.6 Low maintenance.

3.7.7 Ability to wash from the inside if possible.

3.8 Arcades
3.8.1 Should be designed to allow natural light to penetrate.

3.8.2 Dark enclosed arcades are security concerns.

3.8.3 Use of warm materials, such as wood, is preferred.

3.8.4 Should be designed for safety of users.

3.9 Composition of Building
3.9.1 Many of the older buildings on campus were designed with a clear ‘top, middle, bottom’ to the building elevation.

3.9.2 This can be done in a variety of methods from change of materials to changes in building form.

3.10 Details
3.10.1 Building details such as sun shades, use of accent materials, tile, scuppers and other building detail elements can add interest to the building image.

3.10.2 Sun shades made with PV panels can serve a dual use: shading and power generation.

4. What Should This Building Be?
4.1 Set stage for future buildings in the East Campus.

4.2 As impressive as the law school.

4.3 Fit into the neighborhood
4.3.1 Residential area and Arena

4.4 Draw people to the building.

5. Design Presentation Update
5.1 Updated site plan, floor plans and massing images were presented. Copies attached.

5.2 General discussion:
5.2.1 A method to naturally exhaust the rooms using a vertical exhaust duct from each room that vents at the roof is planned.

5.2.2 Residence room windows will have operable areas.

5.2.3 An energy goal of 30% maximum glazing is targeted.

5.2.4 The process of garbage/recycling collection and pick-up needs additional study.

5.2.4.1 Cathy will set up a meeting with housing and University’s garbage/recycling representatives.

5.2.5 Sandy expressed concern about the hearths that are at the ends of the housing bars. She would prefer to have them in the middle so it is more convenient to students. View from hearth is a concern in the center since it would look onto the flat roof areas. Corner hearths allow for more distance views.

5.2.6 The design team is proposing ‘green roof’ areas on about 50% of the flat roof areas of the first floor roof. This is intended to soften the visual appearance of this large roof area from the residence rooms.

5.2.6.1 Maintenance of these roofs is a significant concern.
END OF MEETING NOTES
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Attachments:  Agenda
              Power point presentation by UO
              Graphic materials presented at meeting: open space and site diagrams, revised first floor schemes, kitchen plan.